

# Appendix

## Making a Choice in Vietnam

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 6, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the opinions of our citizens about such distant events as those in South Vietnam can rarely be made at first hand. The perceptive journalism of reporters and editorial writers in those first-rank daily papers acknowledged as national leaders are of great assistance to their readers. But often the smaller papers, whose readers may rarely see these more influential molders of public opinion, have an apathy about international affairs, concentrating on local issues instead.

That this need not be the case when an editor takes his responsibilities for large issues seriously is illustrated by a cogent and thoughtful editorial on the situation in Vietnam published on June 3 in the *Shelbyville, Ind. News*. It is pertinent and timely, and fully as worthy of attention as many such editorials in far larger and better known publications. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Facing the Realities," may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### FACING THE REALITIES

The United States does not have much more time left in which to make some bitter choices in Vietnam. That fact is becoming increasingly evident.

The situation is deteriorating so fast that there no longer is any hope of postponing a decision until after the November election. The President himself is reported to have told his advisers, "Don't talk to me about November. Tell me what to do in the next few days." And as this was written, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, Ambassador Lodge, and other key officials were meeting in Hawaii in an effort to answer that request. The choices before the meeting, as is so often the case with great problems, can be simply stated.

The United States can decide to continue what it is doing; that is, to confine its role in Vietnam to advice, encouragement and material aid of money and arms to the Vietnamese. It can withdraw. Or it can decide to make an all-out commitment using its own military forces, as it did in Korea. But while the choices can be stated simply, there is nothing simple about the consequences of any of them.

Nevertheless, the prospect grows that a mere continuation of our present role will end in failure, not because what we do is inadequate but because the Vietnamese are either unable or unwilling to do their part. A withdrawal, either openly or under the

guise of "neutralization" of the area, would almost certainly mean a Communist takeover. And the trials of a direct U.S. military intervention, we take it, are self-evident to all.

In addition, it seems to us self-evident that in thus choosing between hard courses it is essential not to decide by mere wishes but by tough-minded assessment of the realities of each course.

Few people, for example, would choose a withdrawal except as a last resort. This isn't because the loss of Vietnam to the Communist means the loss of all Asia up to and including Japan; to the south the Communist march could probably be halted at the Malaysian border, to the east with Japan and the Philippines. Still, the loss of Vietnam would mean that an enormous area of southeast Asia would disappear behind the Red curtain, with incalculable effects. However, merely to say that it is worth considerable effort, including even a larger military involvement in the defense of Vietnam, to prevent this from happening, is to beg the real question.

In any battle it is never enough for a commander to say he wishes to hold such-and-such a position. The question is what will it cost to hold it? To ignore the question of cost is foolhardy.

Unfortunately, in the case of Vietnam this is the kind of assessment which the American public has not the information to make. Its own Government has left it completely confused. One day the Secretary of Defense returns with the word that all goes well; the next time he reports gloom; a few weeks later he is once more optimistic.

Perhaps this is because the officials concerned are themselves uncertain and confused. This would be perfectly understandable, and by itself no cause for criticism; there is probably no certain answer. Yet sympathy for the difficulties of decision is overshadowed by the fact that here is a choice in which the whole country is involved, and in which the choice—whatever it is—will demand the support of the whole country.

This being the case, the men meeting in Hawaii have one great duty. That is to be honest with themselves in coldly reckoning the alternatives, and then to be equally honest in telling the country the realities as they see them.

## Sweden's Steady Democratic Progress

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, June 6, a date close to our own Flag Day of June 14, is the Flag Day or Constitution Day of another progressive Western democracy: Sweden. This June 6 commemorates the 155th anniversary of the adoption of the Swedish Constitution of 1809. It is an anniversary of special significance in

the history of Western constitutional development because the Swedish Constitution is the oldest written constitution still in force in Europe. It has been amended many times, but the basic instrument is the document formulated and adopted in 1809.

When our own Founding Fathers drafted the U.S. Constitution they attempted to create an instrument which would embody unchanging principles such as the separation of powers and basic human rights but which would at the same time incorporate flexible enough amendment processes to allow for adaptation to meet the needs of the changing times. The Swedish Constitution makers of 1809 were moved by the same considerations. The instrument they created defined the division of authority between executive and legislature and set forth basic personal liberties.

Swedish democracy has evolved far since 1809, but the essentials have not changed. Although the power of the King has progressively declined and been transferred to the cabinet, the division of authority between executive and legislature still finds its basis in the 1809 constitution. Individual liberties have been elaborated upon—the franchise has been extended from a very small landed minority to universal suffrage—but the basic liberties are those set forth in the 1809 constitution. The Swedish Constitution has evolved with the evolution of parliamentary democracy in Sweden. Like our own Constitution, it has stood the test of time.

Actually, the Swedish constitutional provisions are contained in four acts, or fundamental laws, the first and most basic being the act of 1809. While 1809 thus marks the formal beginning of constitutional government in Sweden, the roots of Sweden's constitutional government reach deep into the Middle Ages. Popular representation, although on a very limited basis, dates to the 1430's. The legislature provided for by the 1809 constitution was founded on the four medieval estates—the nobility, the clergy, the burghers, and the peasants. The 1809 declaration of human rights embodied the medieval rules governing the protection of citizens. The balance between executive and legislative authority arrived at in the constitution was a projection of the constitutional struggles of earlier years. The years 1680-1809 were marked by sharp swings from absolute monarchy to strong parliamentary rule, and in its division of executive and legislative authority the 1809 constitution deliberately sought a compromise between these extremes.

The four basic Swedish constitutional acts have been aptly described as "the history of Sweden written in legal clauses." The act of 1809 was in part

A3038

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 6, 1964

the formalization of centuries of Swedish political custom and practice. In more immediate terms it was a response to the absolutism of King Gustavus IV, his role in the coalition against France during the Napoleonic Wars, and the Swedish defeat in Russia which resulted in the loss of Finland. In March 1809 the King was dethroned; the Riksdag was assembled to draft a new constitution and elect a new king.

Two further basic acts were adopted in the years 1810-12. The Act of Succession of 1810 established the provisions for accession to the Swedish throne. More important were the freedom of the press laws of 1810-12. Based on Sweden's first freedom of the press law of 1766, they spelled out in greater detail the right to freedom of the press delineated in the 1809 constitution. In 1949 a new freedom of the press law was adopted, but in all significant aspects it was based on the principles of the laws of 1766 and 1810-12. Probably the most important and progressive aspect of Sweden's press laws are the regulations governing the public character of official documents. The laws state that every citizen is entitled to gain access to government documents, with certain exceptions; the exceptions are explicitly enumerated. This principle of publicity is considered an essential prerequisite for enlightened, objective public debate.

The fourth constitution act is the Riksdag Act of 1866 which replaced the unicameral legislature based on the four medieval estates with a bicameral legislature elected by restricted suffrage. By the middle of the 19th century the democratizing influence of European liberalism had led to increasing demands for making political life more representative. In 1921 universal adult suffrage was established.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, over the last 155 years Sweden has seen steady democratic progress which has made possible the creation of a stable political society and the achievement of one of the highest standards of living in the world. On the anniversary of the adoption of the Swedish constitution we in America extend our best wishes to the Swedish Government and people.

## Anniversary of D-Day

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

## HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today, June 6, marks the 20th anniversary of D-day when the combined might of the Western Allies under the brilliant direction of General Eisenhower, stormed Hitler's so-called Atlantic wall. During the first 24 hours of the landing 150,000 men went ashore on the Normandy beaches of France. Many of these brave men gave their lives there before that historic day was over. Hitler's grip on the Continent of Europe had to be broken by brute force, and a beginning had to be made. As General Eisenhower said on his return visit to the Normandy coast, once all the plans and preparations had been made, the issue was in the hands of the individual men on the ground. They had no way to go but forward, against a stubborn resourceful and well-entrenched enemy.

D-day was one of the crucial turning points in the crusade against one of the worst tyrannies in the history of mankind. And although we did not realize it at the time, the month of June 1944 saw forces set in motion that influenced not only the war, but the peace. For in that month the Russians began their offensive from the east that was to sweep the Germans out of their eastern positions and result in a permanent Russian military occupation of Eastern Europe.

Today we are preoccupied with a new tyranny but let us not forget that great day of unity and courage 20 years ago.

## RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

## CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

## LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).